

**FORT LAUDERDALE COMMUNITY REDEVELOPMENT AGENCY (CRA)
CITY COMMISSION CONFERENCE ROOM
JULY 24, 2000**

Mayor Naugle called the meeting to order at 4:08 P.M. Roll was called, and a quorum was present.

Present: Mayor Naugle
Commissioner Cindi Hutchinson
Commissioner Gloria F. Katz
Commissioner Carlton B. Moore
Commissioner Tim Smith

Also Present: City Manager
City Attorney
City Clerk

CRA Programs

The City Manager introduced Ms. Kim Jackson, CRA Manager, to make a presentation to supplement the written material distributed. She explained that she was seeking approval of certain CRA programs, effective immediately. Ms. Jackson reported that staff had been meeting with area banks, and the programs were open to as many banks as wished to participate, but 5 banks had stepped up. She introduced representatives of these banks who were present and noted the banks had been involved from the start and demonstrated a commitment to the CRA at large.

Ms. Jackson stated that the programs were flexible and had very attractive terms, and there were several other programs that would support the Low Interest Loan Program in which the banks would participate. She said she had tried to put together a series of programs that would collectively support each other to address the redevelopment issues and obstacles in the CRA.

Ms. Jackson said the first program involved the Low Interest Loan Program. She had used this program in the past, and it had been very successful. Ms. Jackson felt the best thing about this program was that the CRA and the City had virtually no risk. She explained that the banks made the loans for rehabilitation and reconstruction of commercial structures, and agreements were made with the banks that were very specific in the details. Ms. Jackson described a typical scenario in which this program would be utilized and noted that all loans would be presented to the City Commission for approval.

Ms. Jackson stated that the CRA would pay 50% of the interest only on the principal amount over a five-year period. The banks would make the loans at prime rate, with no points and no closing costs, which was a substantial commitment.

Commissioner Smith understood some of the loans would be structured so there would be a prepayment of the interest. He wondered if the prepaid interest would be refunded in the event of a default. Ms. Jackson replied that there would not be a refund. She explained the intent was to rehabilitate properties in such a way as to substantially increase their values, and there was no repayment of the interest. Ms. Jackson noted that if the interest was paid over a five-year term, and the borrower defaulted, less money would have been paid out. She advised that the only time interest had been prepaid in the past had been when there was "ground up" construction and for uses the banks considered risky in any case such as cafes and restaurants. Ms. Jackson noted that the Commission would make any decision to prepay interest.

The City Manager wished to clarify for the record that prepaid interest would not be repaid in the event of a default. Ms. Jackson agreed that was correct.

Commissioner Moore inquired about funding. Ms. Jackson said she was not recommending the use of Community Development Block Grant (CDBG) funds for this program because those funds could not be carried over from one year to another, and this program involved a five-year payout. However, CDBG funds were being recommended for the second program she planned to discuss. Ms. Jackson stated that the CRA currently had \$153,000 in an account called "business incentives," and no monies had been expended from that account. She planned to begin with that amount, which could be used to leverage approximately \$1.5 million in rehabilitation. She said she would probably be presenting a budget in October that would allocate funds from next year into this program as well as the \$153,000.

Commissioner Moore understood this program could only be used for the rehabilitation of existing structures in the target area. Ms. Jackson agreed that was correct, although the Commission could make exceptions for new construction if it was appropriate. She noted that the bank and the Commission would have to agree to such a scenario.

Commissioner Smith believed there was a typographical error on page 3 of the contract in which a sentence at the bottom seemed incomplete. Ms. Jackson acknowledged the error, which had not been noticed until the material had been distributed.

Mr. Stan Brown, Chair of the CRA Advisory Board, stated that the Board had reviewed all of the materials in significant detail and liked it as presented.

Ms. Jackson stated that the second program was more flexible, and it was important for assisting those who could not qualify for the Low Interest Loan Program. She said this was called the Business Relocation and Incentive Program, and it would allow the ability to structure just about any rehabilitation project imaginable. It could be used for property acquisition, filling vacant space, and anything that was encountered in a specific area. Her job would be to find the developers in the private sector to further redevelopment projects.

Ms. Jackson believed this program would be used the most for property acquisition and disposition, and then working with the tanks on the rehabilitation projects. She stated that each case would be presented to the Commission in detail, on a first-come, first-served basis.

Commissioner Moore understood the intent of this program, but it made him a little nervous. It seemed it might allow an individual who owned property in the area to make no investment in his property, and the CRA would purchase it. He was concerned that people would see this as a way to sell property in decline rather than rehabilitate it. Commissioner Moore thought that was the wrong message to send and preferred a process involving Code enforcement so property owners would work with the banks to rehabilitate their properties themselves.

Ms. Jackson stated that unless there was a very particular instance that was included in the CRA plan, TIF funds could not be utilized. She explained that this program would be instantly incorporated into the rewrite of the CRA Plan to allow the purchase of dilapidated property, but it did not say the CRA would buy any dilapidated property in the district. Ms. Jackson stated that funding was very limited, and she did not think this would send the signal that the CRA would have the ability to buy all the dilapidated properties in the area. Further, each of the proposals would be brought to the Commission for approval. Ms. Jackson noted that an inventory would also be prepared ahead of time to identify those properties that might be suitable for acquisition in terms of priority. She thought the language could possibly be reworded to indicate that the CRA was not going to go out and buy all the dilapidated properties.

Commissioner Moore was worried about the few properties that would be purchased. He was concerned about those property owners who would just wait to see if their properties in the targeted area would be purchased rather than undertaking rehabilitation.

Commissioner Smith understood this was all part of the Enterprise Zone (EZ) Loan Program. Ms. Jackson replied it was all part of the package, and the EZ Loan Program currently existed and was recommended for funding next year. She thought as time went on and programs were created or dissolved, flexibility should be retained to move funds where they were needed. Commissioner Smith had thought there was a merchant mix on Sistrunk Boulevard that would be more appropriate in the industrial area, and a program would be developed to move businesses with leases.

Commissioner Moore agreed with Commissioner Smith and recalled past discussions about a commerce center at the 7th/9th Avenue Connector. He had envisioned a commerce type of park where operators of "obnoxious" businesses could be relocated. Commissioner Moore was concerned that this program was too loose and would encourage owners of run down businesses to sit back and wait for the City to step in. Mayor Naugle noted that the City Manager would be forwarding the recommendations for the loans, and he was aware of this concern and would be careful.

The City Manager stated that among the tools developed by Ms. Jackson, there would be various programs, but the policy-making body would approve the use of the tools. He believed the Commission would gain a greater comfort level as progress was made, and the type of thing Commissioner Moore had mentioned would not be allowed. The City Manager understood his concern, but he believed the Commission would see that there were checks and balances to ensure against these things.

Ms. Jackson referred to the EZ Loan Program. She explained that at present, the City itself loaned the money and served as the lending officer. Ms. Jackson wondered if this program was achieving the "biggest bang for the buck." After analyzing it, she felt the problem was that the City was acting as a lending institution, and the money was not being "recycled" very quickly. Further, this program allowed acquisition but did not guarantee a property would be rehabilitated and increase in value. Ms. Jackson said she was trying to put together a package of programs so that instead of loaning the money to a borrower, the City could purchase a property and dispose of it quickly to recycle the money. Ms. Jackson suggested that the EZ Loan Program not be continued in its existing format.

Mayor Naugle noted that one EZ Loan had already been approved in next year's budget. Ms. Jackson agreed there were a few loans pending, and funds had been encumbered from the next fiscal year.

Commissioner Moore stated that banks did not like to make loans in depressed areas, and people were lining up for these EZ Loans. He agreed with positioning the CRA to use other people's money, but he felt there were some benefits to this program. Commissioner Moore pointed out that all of the money was recovered, although it was not recovered quickly. He wondered if consideration had ever been given to bonding, and he pointed out that it was difficult to get investment in slum and blighted areas. He believed the only time redevelopment took place was when there was an infusion of a great deal of public money.

Commissioner Smith thought the infusion of \$500,000 would be enough to get the lending institutions to come forward. Mayor Naugle noted that 5 banks had already come forward and expressed interest. Commissioner Moore understood the banks would make loans in certain situations, but the banks would not make this type of loan. He pointed out that the banks did not, for example, care about how many jobs would be generated. Commissioner Moore felt this type of loan was very beneficial to the community, while conventional loans had to be supported by equity in a project.

Mr. Paul Wiggins, Senior Vice-President of the Bank of America, stated that the banks were interested in making loans in the area, and there were a number of products available, such as SBA products, 504 and 780 loans. He advised a number of opportunities would be brought to the table to encourage investment. Commissioner Moore appreciated Mr. Wiggins' comments, but he wondered if the banks would change the required loan to equity value. Mr. Wiggins did not believe so. Commissioner Moore pointed out that the EZ Loan Program addressed that need, and he did not want to take something off the table that worked.

Commissioner Smith felt this was the preferred way in order to better utilize the monies, but if there were no takers on that program, it could be left in as a fall back. Commissioner Moore had no objection. He did not want the EZ Program to be eliminated because it had been successful. Mayor Naugle believed there had been equity in some of the EZ loans, such as the loan to Dr. Shirley, and in the Case loan. Commissioner Moore agreed, but he did not think those opportunities would have presented themselves without the EZ Loan Program.

Mr. Phil Bacon, Economic Development Manager, stated that if the program anticipated use of CDBG funds, acquisition and disposition of properties was not the national objective, so job creation had to be added to the list of criteria. He stated that any project within the target area needed additional capital in order to make it work given lease rates. Therefore, "gap" financing had been arranged at low interest rates. Mr. Bacon stated that part of the national objective of the program was to create jobs in order to return the dollars to the community. He acknowledged that this did not always lead to the best business deals, but that was not really the purpose of the program. The purpose of the program was to provide funds where needed to create jobs. In the process, facilities had been rehabilitated and businesses brought into the community.

Commissioner Moore said he could not help but agree with Ms. Jackson that leveraging dollars was the best way to go, but he felt this program should still be available for the distressed areas. Commissioner Katz did not mind having the EZ Program as a fallback position, but she felt there should be clear criteria because three jobs, for example, were not enough. Commissioner Moore agreed. Commissioner Katz also felt that if money was going to be loaned, there should be a reasonable expectation of getting it back.

Ms. Jackson had no problem with having the EZ Loan Program as a fallback position with added criteria. Commissioner Moore suggested that the CRA Advisory Board be asked to develop some criteria and changes to the EZ Loan Program. Ms. Jackson agreed that would be important to ensure everything was very clear. Commissioner Moore believed there were good examples of the opportunities available.

Ms. Jackson referred to the Façade Program. She noted that there was limited funding, but she felt it could be fit into the total package, and she did not recommend any changes. Commissioner Moore thought it might be a good idea to change the cost per project. Ms. Jackson advised that would be up to the Commission. Commissioner Moore stated that *Ms. Maria Freeman* had recently acquired a building at Northwest 9th Avenue and Sistrunk Boulevard, and a façade treatment would raise the lease rates from \$5 per square foot to \$7.50 per square foot. He advised that the building had been an eyesore in the neighborhood for years, and she had convinced some attorneys to lease space with the promise that improvements would be made. However, the monies afforded by the Façade Program had been insufficient.

Ms. Freeman stated that \$7,500 did not go very far. She suggested that the Façade dollars be awarded per address or that the amount allowed per project be increased. Mayor Naugle thought it sounded as if one of the other programs should be used to address the whole building rather than just the façade. Ms. Jackson noted that the Merchant Relocation Incentive Program could provide some assistance. She also agreed with Ms. Freeman's suggestion that the Façade Program be administered by address because there were large buildings with multiple addresses, so it would make more sense. Mayor Naugle suggested consideration of a front footage or square footage formula. Commissioner Moore liked the idea and wanted to commend Ms. Freeman for the efforts she had already made.

The City Manager said he understood the desires of the Commission, but he felt he had to remind everyone that they were dealing with limited amounts of money. He wanted the programs to be fair and allow for maximum participation. Commissioner Moore felt that if a particular program worked, it should be continued and even expanded. Commissioner Smith wanted to keep a cap, and then if there was money left over, the cap could be exceeded. He agreed the Façade Program was making a real difference on all the corridors. Mayor Naugle noted that if something exceeded the amount, the City Manager could still present it to the Commission. Commissioner Smith agreed and felt that if there was no one else in line for the program, the cap amount should be exceeded.

Commissioner Moore referred to the proposed boundary in the midtown area of Sistrunk Boulevard. He was concerned that there were certain properties just outside the boundary that were very important to the community. Commissioner Moore pointed out that a major public investment was being made in the African American Research Library. He believed that would have demonstrable impact, and he wanted to capture this opportunity. Commissioner Moore hoped for a little more flexibility with this funding. Mayor Naugle noted that the boundary could be extended to the City limits. Commissioner Moore supported the idea.

Ms. Jackson suggested including 2 noncontiguous areas as Priority No. 1 since the funding was so limited. Commissioner Moore thought that was a good idea. Commissioner Katz did not want this spread too thin. Commissioner Smith asked Ms. Jackson if she could identify the second Priority No. 1. Ms. Jackson displayed a map and pointed out the area.

Motion made by Commissioner Moore and seconded by Commissioner Smith to approve the proposed CRA Programs as presented and discussed. Roll call showed: YEAS: Commissioners Moore, Hutchinson, Katz, Smith, and Mayor Naugle. NAYS: none.

Property Acquisition – 1025-1033 Sistrunk Boulevard

Ms. Jackson displayed a map and pointed out Priority Area No. 1. That had originally been from 8th Avenue to 12th Terrace, and properties had been purchased with CDBG funds over the past few months. She pointed out those properties in relationship to the property being considered for acquisition today. Ms. Jackson stated that property acquisition was very important to the CRA because it allowed a little more control.

Commissioner Moore thought this was wonderful. Commissioner Smith concurred. He referred to the other properties that had been acquired and asked if they were vacant lots or if they contained buildings. He also wondered if they were being maintained. Ms. Jackson replied that the majority were vacant parcels, and staff had tried to target properties that had been problems within the community. She advised that one property had a boarded church that would soon be demolished, and another had a car lot on it. Ms. Jackson added that there had been severe time constraints in using the funding.

At 4:55 P.M., Commissioner Moore left the meeting.

Commissioner Smith wanted to move quickly on the properties owned by the City. He did not think there was anything worse than a blighted building or overgrown lot owned by the City. The City Manager recalled that there had been a two-pronged challenge this past year to match priorities with funding for acquisition as expeditiously as possible. A strategy had been developed very quickly, but it was necessary to address the issues parcel by parcel.

Motion made by Commissioner Smith and seconded by Commissioner Hutchinson to approve the acquisition of property located at 1025-1033 Sistrunk Boulevard. Roll call showed: YEAS: Commissioners Hutchinson, Katz, Smith, and Mayor Naugle. NAYS: none.

Midtown Parcel Planning

Ms. Jackson stated that a parcel-by-parcel analysis was necessary of each site within the targeted area. However, in viewing how to go through the process, several issues had arisen. She explained that Kimley-Horn had been hired by the City to perform a PD&E study on Sistrunk Boulevard, 3rd Avenue and Andrews Avenue in hopes of obtaining federal funds for infrastructure and streetscape improvements.

At 4:59 P.M., Commissioner Moore returned to the meeting.

Ms. Jackson stated that consideration had been given to using Kimley-Horn for the Midtown Parcel Planning, and a quotation had been requested. That quotation had been \$24,900 to go through the analysis with staff, and Kimley-Horn felt the area should be extended to the railroad tracks without additional cost. Ms. Jackson stated that the corner of Sistrunk Boulevard and 7th Avenue was very important, and there were a few parcels between 8th Avenue and the railroad tracks that the City owned. She recommended moving forward with Kimley-Horn and attaching this work to the existing contract for a parcel-by-parcel analysis to determine what should be done with each lot.

Commissioner Moore liked the idea, but he believed there had been study after study, and he knew what everyone wanted. He did not see the need for another charette and preferred to just move forward with the "parceling." Mayor Naugle believed the problem was the consultant did not have any "real world" experience in real estate development. He felt there should be input from developers and other professionals. It was his understanding that Kimley-Horn was more of a design firm. Commissioner Moore believed the CRA Advisory Board had the kind of expertise Mayor Naugle was referring to.

Ms. Jackson said that a parcel-by-parcel analysis required a literal planning/engineering process, but the charette process could be eliminated if that was the Commission's desire. She agreed everyone was aware of the community's desires, but the planning process was important. She advised that she could renegotiate the contract to eliminate the community input process, but this was an important phase because it involved land use decisions that would affect the area well into the future. Ms. Jackson thought the professional planning process was essential.

Mr. Brown stated that the CRA Board had not really anticipated a major charette in the classic style. However, he thought it was important to work with the people who were associated with the properties involved to ensure enough input to provide recommendations. Commissioner Moore said he could accept that. Mayor Naugle suggested that 50% of the study amount be held back until the City Commission approved the report.

Motion made by Commissioner Smith and seconded by Commissioner Hutchinson to approve hiring Kimley-Horn & Associates for the Midtown Parcel Planning as discussed. Roll call showed: YEAS: Commissioners Moore, Hutchinson, Katz, Smith, and Mayor Naugle. NAYS: none.

Presentation by the Bank of America on Residential Development

Ms. Jackson introduced *Ms. Mary Beth Stuart*, of the Bank of America, to make a presentation about residential development. She advised that the CRA Board had seen the presentation, and there had been substantial discussion. Ms. Jackson noted that the proposed partnership agreement had been distributed, and the intent was to attract private dollars into the Sweeting Estates area. She reported that Bank of America was willing to invest \$1 million in the acquisition and was seeking public sector support in terms of relocation, demolition and streetscape improvements. Ms. Jackson said the question before the Commission was whether or not it wanted to support a private sector initiative with Bank of America as a partner. She also wished to recognize Mr. Alan Levy, representing the Broward Workshop, which had been working with staff, along with Mr. Patrick Hadley, from the Governor's office, who had been helping define the type of State financing that might be anticipated. She was very pleased with all the people who had stepped up to assist.

Ms. Stuart stated that the Bank of America was extremely progressive when it came to community redevelopment and investment. She advised that in 1998, a \$350 billion commitment had been made to communities across the country, and a report had recently been issued indicating that \$39.6 billion had been spent in the first year for small business loans, affordable housing, consumer loans, etc. She also stated that Bank of America had a Community Development Bank Executive for the State of Florida who was located in Fort Lauderdale and who was a strong supporter of all the Bank of America programs.

Ms. Stuart said the Bank of America CDC was unique among banks. She discussed some of the projects done in other cities, such as Atlanta and Dallas, along with some upcoming projects in Tampa and St. Petersburg. Ms. Stuart reported that the Bank of America CDC had first been chartered in 1977, and it took a role as a developer and equity investor in urban redevelopment projects. She stated that close to 20,000 affordable housing units had been developed since 1977 for a total investment on the part of the Bank in excess of \$400 million. Ms. Stuart advised that the Bank operated in 16 major metropolitan areas, including the Miami/Fort Lauderdale area.

Ms. Stuart reported that the Bank of America's approach was to form joint ventures and partnerships with cities and neighborhood-based, non-profit development entities to take on real estate development projects to serve as a catalyst for neighborhood revitalization and economic development. She stated that the Bank brought substantial equity capitalization, access to financing, and professional development staff and technical resources. Ms. Stuart said these efforts were focused on economically depressed neighborhoods and on projects that benefited low to moderate-income individuals and families. She advised that the Bank often partnered with non-profit entities, and its belief was that profitability and economic viability were critical to sustaining neighborhood revitalization.

Ms. Stuart referred to infill, single-family home development. She stated that the Bank took a block-by-block approach with a long-term commitment including multiple projects phased over time to revitalize a distressed community. Ms. Stuart advised that a variety of tools were provided, and the Bank had also acquired and rehabilitated a number of large, multi-family properties in urban communities. Another approach involved the reengineering of public housing, and Ms. Stuart presented slides of some of the projects in which the Bank had been involved.

Commissioner Smith inquired about the cost of the housing units, and Ms. Stuart advised the prices were usually in the low \$80,000 range. Commissioner Moore asked how much money St. Petersburg was contributing, and Ms. Stuart advised that the City had provided some demolition money at a cost of \$5,000 to \$8,000 per house. She stated that the City had also been helping buyers who were income-qualified by providing \$2,000 to \$10,000 for down payments. In addition, there were alleys in the neighborhood and narrow streets, so the City had paved the alleyways and provided lighting so they were safe, and garbage collection in the alleys was being provided as well. Ms. Stuart noted that a community police officer had been assigned to the neighborhood and there was strict Code enforcement provided, which had been very helpful in terms of the crime factor. Further, people were becoming more and more involved in the neighborhood.

Ms. Stuart said that a development team had been formed with representatives of Bank of America, the CDC and New Visions CDC to work together on the development side. She stated that assistance from the City would be needed in terms of facilitating demolition of existing substandard units in the target area, platting, master planning, infrastructure improvements such as water and sewer systems, and strict Code enforcement. Ms. Stuart said the Bank would start the land assemblage and take the lead as far as any master planning. In addition, the Bank would coordinate and supervise construction of new single-family homes and coordinate the sales and marketing of the homes. She said the project would be started with about \$1 million in seed capital and leverage that amount for a total Bank investment of \$4.5 million.

Commissioner Moore was very happy about this prospect. He said this was what the community had wanted for a very long time, and he thought the support desired from the City was very reasonable. Commissioner Moore thought that if Bank of America was willing to do this in the target area, it should have some sort of right of first refusal of any other project that could come out of the area just to teach the other banks a lesson. He felt that if there was some other project opportunity, Bank of America should get to review it before allowing others the opportunity.

Commissioner Katz asked what kind of housing was envisioned for the Sweeting area. Ms. Stuart replied that a mix of housing would be appropriate. She thought the project would be started with smaller homes ranging from 1,200 to 1,600 square feet and work upward from there. Ms. Stuart noted that the homes in Tampa/St. Petersburg were priced from \$70,000 to \$95,000, and there had been no trouble selling them. Mayor Naugle asked if garages would be included. Ms. Stuart replied that single and double-car garages could be provided, depending on preference.

Commissioner Moore felt the mix of types of housing was essential, and there was waterfront property in the Sweeting area. He did not think there was a better location in Fort Lauderdale to start the regentrification of the northwest area. Commissioner Smith agreed completely, but he wondered how higher-income individuals could be drawn to the area. Mayor Naugle believed that had occurred on 5th Street through provision of a really good product. Ms. Stuart noted that this was really a small area, and the Bank was committed to building 15 new homes. Commissioner Moore believed the area also allowed for SEPTED features with one way in and one way out.

Commissioner Katz understood the City's help would be necessary in terms of master planning and platting. She wondered how the Bank would handle the dilapidated buildings along the way to the waterfront property. Ms. Stuart stated that as soon as the Commission approved, land assemblage efforts would begin immediately. She thought it would be necessary to assemble as many as 50 parcels, and there would be a focus on dilapidated structures as well as vacant lots.

Commissioner Katz wondered what would happen with the retirement home. Ms. Stuart believed the price would be too high to acquire that property, so strict Code enforcement on the part of the City would have to be employed. In addition, exterior improvements would make it more attractive for the neighborhood.

Commissioner Smith asked if the Bank usually found voluntary sellers. Ms. Stuart replied that the Bank had been fairly successful in its land assemblage activities through the use of local brokers who were active in the community. She said that condemnation had not been necessary thus far. Commissioner Moore agreed condemnation was not a good method, but the lot exchange program had been successful in the Dorsey Riverbend area.

Commissioner Katz assumed the CRA Advisory Board had members who were accountants and real estate agents, etc. Mr. Brown agreed the Board would work very closely with the bank and City staff, although he did not know how much money the City could contribute. Commissioner Katz agreed it was necessary to know where the money would come from. Mr. Brown was very comfortable with the expertise the Bank would bring to the process, and Ms. Stuart advised that the Bank worked closely with cities and community-based, non-profit partners. She explained it behooved the Bank, as a business, to understand what would sell within a particular market.

Commissioner Katz referred to Commissioner Moore's earlier suggestion regarding giving the Bank the right of first refusal. She wondered if he had been including Lincoln Park in that thought. Commissioner Moore felt that would be appropriate.

Ms. Stuart noted that dealing strictly in single-family homes could be very difficult, so the Bank typically liked to deal with a mixture of multi- and single-family homes. Mayor Naugle noted that the City had a Purchasing Code with which it had to conform. Ms. Stuart understood that. Commissioner Moore pointed out that the community desired single-family homes, so he was glad there would be an emphasis on that type of housing.

Commissioner Hutchinson said she had not traveled to Atlanta, but she had examined all the materials and was excited to be a part of this process. Commissioner Smith also favored the proposal, but he was concerned because there were not infinite resources, and there were many areas in the City that needed attention. It appeared it would be necessary to put a lot of money into this over a long period of time, and Commissioner Smith wanted to make sure the money would not run out before other impoverished areas were addressed.

Mayor Naugle stated that the action today would be a commitment to spend significant TIF funds over the next 5 years. Commissioner Smith felt it would put the City in a posture in which it would have to come up with a lot of money. He was willing to support this, but he did not want anyone to forget that there were other large areas where assistance was needed.

Commissioner Moore thought it was time for the City to be creative and consider bonding the TIF funds. Mayor Naugle agreed it might be necessary to bond the TIF funds, but he did not want to consider bonding CDBG dollars because that would “tie hands” in terms of assistance in other areas.

Motion made by Commissioner Moore and seconded by Commissioner Hutchinson to approve the partnership agreement with Bank of America. Roll call showed: YEAS: Commissioners Moore, Hutchinson, Katz, Smith, and Mayor Naugle. NAYS: none.

The City Manager wished to note for the record that staff resources were limited, but staff was on track to move City offices to Lincoln Park. In the meantime, other projects had been put on the “back burner.” He did not want this to come as a surprise to anyone. Commissioner Moore did not understand. The City Manager explained that the Commission had directed staff to move City offices out to Lincoln Park, and staff was working on that project while others were pending. Now, it appeared the Bank would be given a certain period of time to come up with a proposal.

Commissioner Moore wished to clarify his intent. He was glad that the Bank of America would build single-family homes in the Sweeting area. Afterwards, if it was successful, then “some of the cherries” could be examined such as Lincoln Park. He thought the Lincoln Park design was already “out of the box.” Commissioner Smith understood the intent was to have City functions at Lincoln Park for many years. Commissioner Moore agreed.

Commissioner Katz said she would hate to spend the money and time to rehabilitate Lincoln Park only to have someone come along a year or two later with a wonderful plan for homes on the site. Commissioner Moore was not concerned about that because if a housing plan were a good deal, a developer would be willing to pay for it so the City could recoup its investment. Further, an economic feasibility study would be conducted at that point, and decisions would be based on such a study that examined all of the issues associated with the Lincoln Park property. He did not want to delay placing City functions on the site, particularly if the City was renting property for those functions elsewhere.

Commissioner Smith believed there had been interest expressed in the Lincoln Park property. Mayor Naugle was not aware of any proposals. Commissioner Smith understood Mr. Milton Jones was interested. Mayor Naugle was not aware of any meetings with the majority of the Commission. Commissioner Moore believed these were only conversations about future possibilities. However, space was needed for staff now, and the community surrounding Lincoln Park was not interested in multi-family units on the site.

Commissioner Smith said he had always thought there was an opportunity for a new City Hall on Northwest 7th Avenue where the City owned 10 acres of land. However, he did not expect the City Manager to explore that idea when there was an interim 5-year plan to use Lincoln Park. Commissioner Moore pointed out that employees would have to have space during the 5 years it would take to develop such a plan. Commissioner Smith felt proposals for Lincoln Park should be solicited for a 60-day period to determine if there was any interest in building single-family homes on the site at this time. He did not believe the market had been tested yet, and he did not think that would delay any other plans.

Mayor Naugle was willing to explore interest in developing home ownership opportunities on the site. Commissioner Smith agreed cluster homes or townhouses might be appropriate. Commissioner Katz saw no harm in exploring the possibilities. Commissioner Moore disagreed. He felt a zero lot line development would be terrible in this area. Mayor Naugle felt such developments had the same appearance as single-family neighborhoods.

Commissioner Katz asked Ms. Jackson if anyone had approached her in this regard. Ms. Jackson stated that Sean Jones had expressed interest in Lincoln Park at one of the Commission's public meetings. She thought the Bank of America would also be very interested in a right of first refusal. Ms. Jackson believed there was interest, but nothing had been put on paper to her knowledge. Commissioner Moore stated that the Bank of America was also aware that Lincoln Park would be used for City employees for the next few years, but it would take 3 to 5 years to deal with the Sweeting area project. Commissioner Smith pointed out that there were hundreds of property owners to deal with in the Sweeting area while Lincoln Park only had 1 owner.

At 6:00 P.M., Commissioner Moore left the meeting.

Mr. Brown recalled that an RFQ had been issued a couple of years ago on two occasions, and no interest in the Lincoln Park site had been expressed at that time. In addition, the Advisory Board had examined the Lincoln Park site a couple of years ago, and the sense of the Board at the time had been that an alternative use for 5 years would make more sense. Mayor Naugle did not think there was an appropriate project or sufficient interest in the site now.

The City Manager said that he had to raise this subject because there would not be another meeting until September, and he had not wanted to have 5 different opinions on the subject in the meantime. He had been seeking clarity, and he had just been advised the first RFQ had been issued 4 years ago without result. The City Manager felt that given that information and the direction of the Commission, staff would proceed with the plans for office facilities at Lincoln Park. He pointed out that if someone did come up with a viable proposal, nothing would prevent him from presenting it to the City. However, he did not think a formal RFP process would be worthwhile at this time.

At 6:02 P.M., Commissioner Moore returned to the meeting.

Commissioner Katz did not think the City would be interested in entertaining proposals after it had spent a lot of money renovating the property for office use. She did not think any developer would be willing to pay enough for the site for the City to recoup its costs. If expressions of interest were not going to be sought, she hoped everyone understood that the property could not be used for anything else in the next 5 years. Commissioner Smith thought that when Mr. Jones had expressed interest, the Commission had "sent him packing." He said that if he were a member of the Jones family, he would not want to spend \$100,000 developing a plan that would not be entertained for 5 years.

The City Manager did not think the City Commission could be effectively bound for a 5-year period. Mayor Naugle was sure that if someone came forward with a proposal in a year and a half, the Commission would consider it. He thought it was unlikely that an acceptable proposal would be forthcoming after a lot of money was invested in the property. Further, he did not think there would be money available while the Sweeting area was addressed.

Commissioner Smith inquired as to the cost of seeking proposals. The City Manager said that would depend on the scope of the project. Mayor Naugle thought the RFP used before could be updated and used again. The City Manager said he would have to get back to the Commission with the cost. Commissioner Moore thought that whoever assumed his seat on the Commission would represent the people in the district, and they had consistently indicated that no more multi-family units were desired in this area.

Code Enforcement Officer Criteria

It was the consensus to approve the criteria for the Code Enforcement Officers for the CRA District. Mr. Pete Witschen, Assistant City Manager, reported that these Code officers would be used for the expanded boundaries.

CRA Manager's Report

Ms. Jackson noted that a written report had been distributed, but she wanted to introduce Mr. Darnell Kimbrew, the new CRA Project Manager, who had been onboard for 3 days. Mayor Naugle asked him where he had last worked, and Mr. Kimbrew replied he had worked for Broward County.

Commissioner Smith inquired about the CRA work schedule. He asked when the application would be submitted to the County. Ms. Jackson stated that a finding of necessity had to be made, and proposals for a consultant would have to be sought. She did not have all of the information with her, but she said she could forward it to the Commission, and she expected the consultant to be onboard in September. Commissioner Smith asked how long the consultant's work would take, but Ms. Jackson could not provide an accurate answer at this time.

Commissioner Smith was concerned because there was a County Commission election in November, and he thought it would be best to submit the application prior to that election. Mr. David Hardwell said it would depend how long the study took, but he thought that schedule could be met. Ms. Jackson agreed staff could try to meet that time frame. Commissioner Smith pointed out that a decision had been made to do this over 3 years ago, and he thought it would be prudent to try and do it by October 31, 2000. The City Manager stated that staff would give it the best shot, but he did not know that it would be disadvantageous to wait until after the election, particularly since there would be 4 County Commissioners representing different portions of Fort Lauderdale.

At 6:08 P.M., Commissioner Moore left the meeting.

Commissioner Smith noted that a planning and engineering firm was going to be hired to deal with the Gateway area, and he understood proposals would be received on August 7, 2000. That was his birthday, and Commissioner Smith wanted to thank staff for the birthday present.

There being no further business before the Board of Commissioners, the meeting was adjourned at 6:13 P.M.